Minutes of the Certification Panel Open Session Meeting
CalPac Section SRM
September 17, 2012

The Panel met in conjunction with the regular CalPac fall meeting at the Hyatt Regency, Sacramento, CA. Present: Larry Ford, Chairman; Rob Pearce; Larry Forero, Mike Connor, John Harper, Bill Frost, Susan Marshall, and Matt Dias. Susan is a new panel member subject to approval by the CalPac board and the Board of Forestry.

The open session was called to order by Chairman Ford.

Ford introduced Matt Dias, Executive Officer, Foresters Licensing, Board of Forestry and Fire Protection.

Minutes of the April 13, 2012 meeting open session were approved. (Motion by Pearce, second by Forero, unanimous.)

Ford reviewed the Checklist of Panel Actions, including assignments and status.

Frost and Dias reported on the CRM description, which is being reviewed by the PFEC prior to inclusion in the Forest Practice rules.

Connor reported on the review of the ARM program by Jon Gustafson and him. (See attached "Associate Rangeland Manager Program Alternatives".) The discussion that followed included:
1) The value or lack thereof of the current ARM. The panel was reminded that candidates cannot take the exam without achieving the experience and other requirements as well as the educational requirements.
2) Any program giving students recognition is good.
3) Colleges need to justify rangeland management curricula. Having students in an ARM program may help.
4) The advantages and difficulties of mentoring ARMs were discussed.

Conclusion: The panel tabled the discussion on ARMs and Ford will recommend to the Section Board that another way be found to offer education to students and other prospective CRMs; and to request the Section offer CRM mentors to students interested in the ARM/CRM. (Motion by Connor, second by Frost, unanimous.)

Ford reported no progress on the position paper on skills needed to manage conservation lands.

Harper agreed to update the on-line list of educational resources for CRM candidates.

The open session was adjourned at 11:05 am.

California-Pacific Section, Society for Range Management
Associate Rangeland Manager Program Alternatives
September 11, 2012: Mike Connor and Jon Gustafson

Problem Statement:

The California-Pacific Section of the SRM currently suffers an extremely weak basis for what was formerly identified as the Associate Rangeland Manager (ARM) program. The formal structure of the program was designed following the legal authorities (Title 12 of the Board of Forestry Regulations) of the CRM program. However, it has been determined that Title 12 does not extend to cover ARM thus nullifying the functional parameters of the ARM program.

Presented as an interim status for those seeking CRM certification and licensing, the ARM program has attracted very limited participation with most CRM seekers ignoring ARM as an extra step and an extra cost having little direct benefit to the applicant. While the ARM status itself has some benefits, those seeking to determine qualification limitations actually can benefit immediately by way of a review of educational qualifications pertaining to qualification requirements of the CRM program.

Alternative 1) *Eliminate ARM altogether*

> Pros: Expedient, convenient; incurs no direct costs or responsibility
> Cons: Opportunity lost in nurturing CRM maybes into CRM seekers; increased appearance of indifference of the CRM program towards potential applicants; opportunity lost in professional development

Alternative 2) *Strip down ARM to a simple review of educational qualifications for those interested in CRM.* Could be fee based or without fee.

> Pros: Apparently efficient; maintains limited contact with potential CRM seekers
> Cons: Focus is limited to educational requirements; increased likelihood of becoming a bureaucratic evaluation based on courses on a checklist alone; opportunity lost in professional development

Alternative 3) *Restructure ARM as a process of engaging both potential CRMs as well as current CRMs.* Implement a service-based voluntary mentoring program which can be of benefit to potential CRMs, current CRMs and the Section.

> Pros: Disassociates ARM from a previously low-benefit approach; allows integration of students across a spectrum of study areas to participate, with or without CRM status as the ultimate outcome; would afford Section members an opportunity to contribute in a very effective way
> Cons: Requires commitment and dedication of the Section and members